

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Civil Works Review Board (CWRB), Roseau River Flood Damage Reduction Feasibility Study

Date of CWRB: 20 September 2006

CWRB Members: MG Johnson (DCG, Chair), MG Riley (DCW), Tom Waters (Planning CoP), Ed Theriot (NAD RIT Leader) and Patricia Rivers (SWD RIT Leader).

Key Participants:

HQUSACE: CWRB Member, Tom Waters (Chief, MVD RIT), Office of Water Project Review (Colosimo, Hughes, Gallihugh, Moyer), Policy and Policy Compliance Division (Leef), Office of Counsel (Bindner) & MVD RIT (Montvai and Lucyshyn).

MVD: Mike Rogers, Mike Harden, Susan Smith, Bob Petersen.

MVP: Col Pfenning via VTC, Judy DesHarnais, Aaron Snyder, Terry Birkenstock.

City of Roseau: Todd Peterson.

ASA(CW): Doug Lamont

OMB: None

OWPR Recommendation: Approval of the report for release for State and Agency review.

CWRB Decision Made: Approval of release of the report for State and Agency review.

Vote: Unanimous.

Key Issues/Questions Raised by the CWRB:

1. Is there an expectation from the sponsor that all flood risk will be removed? The project sponsor indicated that communications with the district have been clear that this project will not control all flooding, but with the additional control provided by the channel improvements, the City of Roseau will be better capable of meeting any future flood fighting needs.

2. ASA(CW)'s office questioned cost sharing of the new highway bridges in fast land as a non-Federal sponsor LERRD. ER 1105-2-100, paragraph E-21c.(2), page E-

SUBJECT: Civil Works Review Board (CWRB), Roseau River Flood Damage Reduction Feasibility Study

130, is clear that highway bridges over channel cuts in fast lands are highway relocations and are part of LERRDs.

3. A question was asked how future proposed adaptive management will be funded. The District explained that post flood adaptive management associated with surveying fish stranding would be funded by the sponsor as part of their OMRR&R responsibility for the project. Coordination during the design phase will continue with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Minnesota Department of Natural resources.

4. The Chairman questioned whether the issue concerning the contingency rate was truly resolved since the analysis was still using 26% contingency which is higher than the 20% called for in policy. OWPR staff explained that the cost estimate has been reviewed by the district resulting in the reduction of some contingencies. Items with increased levels of uncertainty have larger contingencies resulting in levels higher than the 20 percent indicated in ER 1110-2-1302. The contingencies for the FDR portions of the project vary between 25 and 26 percent. Based on the fact that there were some increased levels of uncertainty with some of the project feature, OWPR staff believed that the higher contingency was warranted.

5. The milestone schedule shows an estimated completion date of Oct 06 for the Chief of Engineer's Report. It was noted that this may be an ambitious milestone.

6. A suggestion was made that future project summary reports on flood damage reduction projects should describe the authority for construction of existing levees, their current condition and more detailed description of proposed levees and channels.

7. It was suggested that members of the ITR team should be online during future CWRB meetings.

Other Issues of Note: None.

Actions Required prior to S&A Review : None.

Attachments: PowerPoint handouts (including District Engineer, Division Engineer, Sponsor and Office of Water Project Review briefs); Project Summary; DE Transmittal Letter; and Proposed Chief of Engineers Report.